

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/594,244	SEKIMOTO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	DABORAH CHACKO DAVIS	1795	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Mr. Akihiro Yamazaki. (3) _____.

(2) Daborah Chacko-Davis. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 22 May 2009.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-21.

Identification of prior art discussed: U. S. Patent No. 5,254,435 (Grandmont et al).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representative discussed that Grandmont et al., does not teach that the photoimageable ink is applied as a liquid photoimageable ink layer, and that Grandmont et al., teaches using a solid film or an already dried film, as the photoimageable layer on the substrate.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Daborah Chacko-Davis/
Examiner, Art Unit 1795